



PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

October 13, 2010

7:30 P.M.

**CITY OF FREDERICKSBURG
715 PRINCESS ANNE STREET
COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

COMMISSION MEMBERS

**Roy McAfee, Chair
Dr. Roy Gratz, Vice-Chair
Susan Spears, Secretary
Ricardo Rigual, Absent
Edward Whelan, III
Vic Ramoneda
Berkley Mitchell**

CITY STAFF

**Ray Ocel, Director of Planning
Erik Nelson, Sr. Planner**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The October 13, 2010 Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Roy McAfee.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

- o September 29, 2010 – Approved/adopted as submitted.

4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Dr. Gratz made a motion to nominate Mr. McAfee as Chair.
Ms. Spears seconded the motion.
Motion carried by a vote of 6 – 0

Ms. Spears made a motion to nominate Dr. Gratz as Vice-Chair.
Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion.
Motion carried by a vote of 6 – 0

Ms. Spears made a motion to nominate Mr. Mitchell as Secretary
Mr. Whelan seconded the motion.
Motion carried by a vote of 6 – 0

Officers will assume duties at the October 27, 2010 Planning Commission meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

5. **SUP2009-15: W. Scott Howson-** Request of amend condition #2 of a previously approved Special Use Permit request to utilize the structure located at 710 Lafayette Boulevard as a single family detached dwelling. The property is zoned C-T, Commercial Transitional which permits single family detached dwelling by special use permit. Condition #2 requires the applicant to obtain an occupancy permit within 9 months of the approval of the special use permit and the applicant requests to extend this time period. The property is designated as Transitional Commercial/Office on the Future Land Use Map contained within the 2007 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Ocel presented the application. He said that On October 13, 2009, the applicant received City Council approval to convert the building located at 710 Lafayette Boulevard to a single family house. The second condition of the approval required the applicant to obtain an occupancy permit within nine months of the approval of the special use permit. While the applicant has diligently pursued converting the structure to a single family house he has not completed the work and is requesting an extension of time to complete the work. Staff concurs with the request and recommends a nine month extension.

At its September 9, 2009 public hearing on this item, the Planning Commission, by a vote of 7-0 recommended approval of the special use permit with the conditions recommended by staff. At this meeting the Commission did not hear any comments from the public. Commission members did not raise any comments or concerns in regard to the application.

Dr. Gratz confirmed that the request is for a nine month extension.

Mr. Ocel said this was correct.

There was no public comment on this item.

Mr. McAfee closed the public hearing.

Mr. Whelan made a motion to recommend approval of the special use permit amended condition as outlined by staff.

Mr. Ramoneda seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6 – 0.

6. **SUP2009-09: Serenity Home, Inc.** Request to amend condition # 1 of a previously approved Special Use Permit request in order to relocate and operate Serenity Home at 316 Bridgewater Street. The applicant requests to operate this institutional housing use at this location which provides residential treatment for medically stable chemically dependent adult males. Condition #2 requires the applicant to obtain an occupancy permit within 12 months of the approval of the special use permit and the applicant requests to extend this time period. The property is zoned CT, Commercial Transitional and is designated as Transitional/Office on the Future Land Use Map contained within the 2007 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Ocel presented the application. He said On June 23, 2009, the applicant received City Council approval to renovate the building located at 316 Bridgewater Street in order to establish a residential treatment program for medically stable chemically dependent adult males. The first condition of the approval required the applicant to commence operation of the use within 12 months of the approval of the special use permit. While the applicant has diligently pursued the project, the work to renovate the building has not been completed and the applicant is requesting

an extension of 12 months time to complete the work. Staff concurs with the request and recommends a 12 month extension. All other conditions remain the same.

To date the applicant has purchased the property as opposed to their original plan to lease the building and are now fundraising to obtain funds to renovate the building.

At its May 27, 2009 meeting, the Planning Commission, by a vote of 6-0 recommended approval of the special use permit with the conditions recommended by staff. At the May 13th public hearing, 10 members of the public spoke in regard to the application. All but one speaker spoke in favor of the application.

There was no public comment on this application.

Mr. McAfee closed the public hearing.

Mr. Mitchell asked for confirmation that the property is now owned by the applicants and that they have gone to settlement.

Mr. Ocel said this was correct.

Mr. Mitchell noted that he had abstained from voting on this item in the past due to conflict of interest but now that the applicants own the property, he no longer has that conflict.

Mr. Mitchell made a motion to recommend approval of the special use permit amended condition as outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Whelan seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6 – 0.

- 7. Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment** - Amending City Code Chapter 78, Zoning, Planning and Development, Article I, In General, Definitions Section 78-1 in order to add a definition of a transportation recycling facility. Further amendment includes amending Section 78-722, uses permitted by special use permit in the I-2, General Industrial zoning district by adding a transportation recycling facility as a use permitted by special use permit.

Mr. Ocel presented the application. He said that staff requests that the Planning Commission review two proposed text amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinance:

1. The first text amendment entails adding language to the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Transportation Recycling Facility by special use permit in the I-2 district
2. A second text amendment is proposed in order to provide a definition of a Transportation Recycling Facility.

Amend Sec. 78-722 to permit a Transportation Recycling Facility, by special use permit.

The new owner of 1351 Belman Road, M&M Auto Parts, Inc. has requested that the I-2 Zoning District regulations be amended to permit the establishment of a Transportation Recycling Facility with retail sales area not to exceed 40% of the gross floor area devoted to warehouse use by special use permit. The applicant proposes to utilize the property for the activities listed on attachment 2 of their application.

While the I-2 zoning district permits most of the uses proposed by the applicant as well as other heavy industrial uses, the district does not permit the dismantling, demolition or abandonment of automobiles or other vehicles or machinery or parts and the applicant is proposing to dismantle vehicles on the property.

The I-2 zoning district is established to provide for medium to heavy industrial land uses in areas of the city appropriate to adequately serve the physical, transportation access, and environmental impacts of such industrial development. In this case, the property is zoned General Industrial and the land use designation is also General Industrial. The other industrial zoning category in use in the City is I-1, Light Industrial.

The entire industrial park where this property is located is zoned I-2 and contains many varied type of uses including the City's Public Works Shop which is located in close proximity (corner of Belman and Tyler) to the applicant's property.

The property is located in Land Use Planning Area 9: Battlefield Industrial Park.

Planning Area 9 is bounded by the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park to the west, a portion of Lafayette Boulevard and Hazel Run to the north, the railway to the east, and the City limit to the south. This area encompasses the City's industrial park. The Economic Development Authority's JumpStart! Report recommends rezoning portions of the Blue and Gray Parkway corridor from industrial to commercial uses, which reflects long-term City planning.

While there is no language in the Plan that directly addresses this property, the proposed uses proposed by M&M will not be detrimental to surrounding land uses. The applicant's special use permit application that is the subject of the next agenda item provides a detailed process for guidance to facility personnel to address any spills or release of fluids that may occur on site. This plan addresses the environmental factor noted above that states: "Special attention and protection should be afforded the Hazel Run valley when drainage is addressed on specific industrial sites."

Although there are two other areas zoned I-2 in the City, the Battlefield Industrial Park is the City's most prominent area reserved for heavy industrial uses and the industrial park has developed in this manner since its inception. The M&M Auto business will be another business established in the Park that will fit within the context of the Park as well as provide additional tax revenue and job opportunities.

Amend Sec. 78-1 to add a definition of a Transportation Recycling Facility

The following definition of a transportation recycling facility is proposed to be added to the Zoning Ordinance:

Transportation Recycling Facility means a facility where the sale, distribution, disassembly, repair, inventory, reconditioning, dismantling, processing, packaging, storage (inside and outside), recycling and other similar uses of machinery, vehicles, transportation cars, metal, auto parts and equipment takes place.

The uses listed in the definition will enable the applicant to conduct the business in a similar manner as the existing facility in Stafford County.

Mr. Ocel noted that staff had received letters in favor of the proposed text amendment and upcoming special use permit request for M&M Auto parts. Letters of support were received from Carico at 1300 Belman Road; Milstead & Milstead at 1350 Belman Road and the Associate Publisher at Print Innovators.

Mr. Ocel said that the Public Works Department is also in support of the proposed facility.

Mr. Ocel said that staff recommends approval of a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance permitting a transportation recycling facility by sup in the I-2district and providing a definition a transportation recycling facility.

Mr. McAfee referenced the June 23 letter from M&M, Item #2, which asks to amend Section 78-721, by adding as a permitted use: "(21) Transportation Recycling Facility with retail sales area.... He said he did not see the "retail sales" portion addressed.

Mr. Ocel said that the I-2 zoning district now allows retail with that percentage.

Mr. Charlie Payne, Attorney for the applicant, 725 Jackson Street, Fredericksburg, 22401, said he did not have much more to add to Mr. Ocel's comments but that M&M Auto Parts has been in the area (Stafford) for close to 60 years. He said it is a unique business and in times of going green and needing recycling facilities such as this, it would be a good neighbor and an asset to the City.

There was no public comment on this item.

Mr. McAfee closed the public hearing.

8. **SUP2010-07: M&M Auto Parts, Inc.** Special Use Permit request to operate a transportation recycling facility at 1351 Belman Road. The property is zoned I-2, General Industrial and is designated as General Industrial on the Future Land Use Map contained within the 2007 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Ocel said M&M Auto Parts, Inc. is the applicant and property owner requesting a special use permit to operate a transportation recycling facility located at 1351 Belman Road in the Battlefield Industrial Park. Please see sheet 1 on the front of the Generalized Development Plan (GDP). When the special use permit was filed, M&M was the contract owner of the property but since has acquired the property.

While there is no language in the Plan that directly addresses this property, the uses proposed by M&M will not be detrimental to surrounding land uses. Additionally, the applicant's special use permit application provides detailed guidance to facility personnel to address any spills or release of fluids that may occur on site. This plan addresses the environmental factor noted above that states: "Special attention and protection should be afforded the Hazel Run valley when drainage is addressed on specific industrial sites."

Although there are two other areas zoned I-2 in the City, the Battlefield Industrial Park is the City's most prominent area designated for heavy industrial uses and the industrial park has developed in this manner since its inception. The M&M Auto business will be another business established in the Park that will fit within the context of the Park as well as provide additional tax revenue and job opportunities.

The existing land uses in the industrial park are oriented towards medium to heavy industrial uses as well as some other lighter industrial uses. The new Free Lance Star facility is located directly to the south of this property and the City Public Works Shop and the Sunbelt Rental Center are located across Belman Road.

The future land use map contained within the Comprehensive Plan designates this property as General Industrial as is all of the land in the Battlefield Industrial Park. The railroad tracks are located immediately east of the property and boarder the rear property line. However, the applicant does not anticipate the use of the railroad at this time but may in the future. No new projects are proposed in the area at this time and the industrial park property has no pending

applications. It is not anticipated that the existing land uses in the area will change in the near future.

Reuse of the property as proposed should not hinder development elsewhere in the industrial park. The applicant notes that the building will be used as is with some indoor renovation work.

Outdoor improvements include the following and can be found on sheet 3 of the GDP:

1. Addition of a rack and pallet storage area towards the front of the property. Body parts removed from vehicles will be stored in these racks. Parts include fenders, doors and hoods. See pictures on sheet 4 of the GDP.
2. Crusher and scrap processing. Stripped vehicles that are no longer needed are crushed and loaded for transport in this area.
3. Incoming salvage storage. Incoming vehicles are temporarily stored in this location until they are logged into the computer system and readied for disassembly and processing.
4. Rack Storage. Additional storage area adjacent to the salvage storage area for larger car parts.

Due to the addition of the outdoor activities and storage areas, the storage areas on the property are required to be fully screened from adjacent properties and roads. These areas include the rack and pallet storage area in front of the building and the area on the south end of the building and listed above. The applicant proposes to install a fence along the front of the property to screen the rack and pallet storage area. A fence detail can be found on sheet 4 of the GDP. The proposed fence material is corrugated steel panels at a height of eight feet and a picture of fence can be seen on sheet 5 of the GDP as this is a fence the applicant currently is using at his facility in Stafford County. A perspective of the fence is shown on the single color site plan sheet. Note that a row of evergreen trees is proposed to be planted in front of the fence to break up the lengthy expanse of the fence. A line of sight cross section is shown on sheet 4 of the GDP that shows that the proposed fence will provide the screening necessary to screen the rack storage from Belman Road.

The existing vegetation along the southern end of the property will be maintained in order to screen the storage area adjacent to the southern end of the building. As noted earlier, if this vegetation does not adequately provide a year round screen of the storage area, additional vegetation will be required to be planted.

The site is arranged in a manner that locates parking areas primarily around the perimeter of the property with the building being centrally located. In addition, the existing parking area towards the front of the building will be maintained and six loading spaces will be created near the parking area. Additional parking spaces are being proposed for company vehicles and will be located between the front parking area and the rack and pallet storage area in front of the property.

Staff requested that a limited traffic analysis be conducted and submitted as part of the application. The traffic analysis was conducted by the applicant and the emphasis of the study was to determine any negative traffic impacts upon Belman Road and the intersection of Belman Road and the Blue and Gray Parkway and to determine any needed improvements to this intersection such as lengthening turn lanes, installing turn lanes and upgrading intersection signalization.

The applicant notes that average daily traffic count will be approximately 200 vehicles per day with most of these trips occurring early in the week and between the hours of 7:00 am and 7:59 am. The applicant concludes that the proposed use will not adversely affect the surrounding road system and thus will not require any road improvements. This conclusion appears to be supported by the data derived from traffic counts taken at the existing facility in Stafford County and assumptions about future demand and expansion of the operations. (An installation

department is anticipated to be added at this location) Therefore, it appears the existing road infrastructure is adequate to accommodate the projected traffic from the proposed use.

Staff recommends approval of special use permit and if the Planning Commission recommends approval of the special use permit, the following conditions are recommended:

- That the development of the property be in general conformance with the Generalized Development Plan prepared by Bagby, Caldwell and Associates, PC dated July, 2010 and the Site Plan prepared by Architectural Resources, Inc. dated 9-2-10.
- That the proposed use of the property is permitted only so long as it continues and is not discontinued for more than two years.
- The use of the property shall commence within one year of the date of the adoption of the City Council resolution.
- That additional evergreen trees be planted along the southern property line if it is determined by the Zoning Administrator that the existing vegetation does not completely screen the outdoor storage area from adjacent properties or streets.

Mr. Ramoneda asked if the employment figures stated by the applicant are annually or for the term of their existence.

Mr. Payne, Attorney for the applicants, 725 Jackson Street, 22401, said it was for the duration of the current business.

Mr. McAfee asked if Mr. Fawcett, Director of Public Works had any comments regarding hazardous materials.

Mr. Ocel said Mr. Fawcett is aware of the proposed use and that the Fire Marshal had actually requested a hazardous fluids plan, which was addressed and provided.

Mr. Payne reiterated that M&M Auto Parts has been around this area for almost 60 years and within that time has employed 300+ employees. He said Mr. Ocel covered the basics of the application and believes that the proposed use is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Dr. Gratz said he is concerned with potential environmental impacts/issues. He asked how the hazardous materials would be disposed.

Mr. Morrow, M&M Auto Parts, Stafford, 22554, said that all petroleum products are evacuated/taken out and reused. He said the oil is recycled and used for heat, the gas is used for their vehicles and that the refrigerant is shipped out to authorized companies. Also, the antifreeze is picked up by authorized companies.

Dr. Gratz confirmed then that the oil is burned for heat, the gas is reused as fuel for company vehicles and the rest is hauled away.

Mr. Morrow said this is correct.

Mr. Morrow also noted that the DEQ (Department for Environmental Quality) conducts random inspections and that they are also required to have a stormwater prevention plan in place. He also noted that tires are resold and others are removed to approved facilities. He said that 1,000 – 12,000 gallons of petroleum are permitted to be stored on the facility.

Mr. McAfee asked Mr. Morrow to address what happens to old batteries.

Mr. Morrow said they are either resold or shipped to licensed companies authorized to recycle the batteries.

Mr. McAfee asked how often the DEQ inspections are held.

Mr. Morrow said they are anywhere from one to two times per year.

Mr. McAfee asked if their existing facility had ever failed an inspection.

Mr. Morrow said they had never failed but that they had a one-time incidence where the inspector informed them that they need to provide a special barrel for gas extraction filters. They had previously been throwing them away in the dumpster. This has been corrected per DEQ's instruction.

There was no public comment on this item.

Mr. McAfee closed the public hearing.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS/ACTION ITEMS

9. **The Fredericksburg Watershed Management Property Plan** has been prepared as a guide to decision making in regard to the 4,232 acres of land that the City placed in a conservation easement in 2006. The property's conservation easement provides a high level of protection from development, vegetation removal, and other major alterations. Further issues that needed to be addressed are addressed in the Plan and include access management, trails management, and new recreational use. Consequently, a management plan outlining guidance and policies to balance management of the exceptional natural resources of the property with continued public recreation use was developed.

Mr. Nelson provided an update of changes made since the last discussion on the Plan. Although staff had addressed most of the Commission's concerns and suggestions, there were still sections of the document that needed clarification. In response, staff has tied the Action items closer to the analysis in the body of the overall Plan. Page number references also allow any reader to readily discern the basis of the various courses of proposed activity.

The Commission had differing viewpoints on the two items brought by up by Friends of the Rappahannock (FOR). These issues relate to hunting safety zones and construction of a parking area at the end of Richards Ferry Road, in Culpeper County. Staff has confirmed that FOR knows that the proposed parking area would not be near the river, but rather at the end of an existing road. Their response is that they believe any improvements will draw users to that portion of the property.

Mr. Nelson said that a proposed compromise is to establish a 100-yard safety zone around the camping area at the confluence, which is noted on Page 43, Section 5.3.3 **Camping Areas**.

Ms. Spears addressed Mr. Tippet, who was sitting in the audience, and thanked him and F.O.R. for their hard work on the Plan. She said she hoped they could respect the opinion of one another and that she continues to disagree with the hunting issue and requiring safety zones.

Following is a verbatim transcript of Commissioner Spears comments:

"There is no official language in the easement relative to hunting because there was no reason for the document to contain such language. All laws that were already in effect relative to hunting on these lands were retained in the easement."

We have been told there have been no hunting incidents on the property. Nor has there been any known misuse of the land by hunters. Of note, this has remained true since the easement went into effect.

Reflecting on this process, I believe this is how we came to be where we are today:

At some point in the past year, FOR leadership talked to city officials about creating a Watershed Property Management Plan. Through their organization, they were able to obtain a grant to fund the necessary work. They were not far into writing the plan when they realized they needed additional input in order to adequately prepare the document. Area experts from the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, the Virginia Outdoor Foundation, the Nature Conservancy, and the City of Fredericksburg joined in the process. At this point, FOR went from being "authors" to "facilitators," as is noted on the front page of the Plan.

My understanding is that in discussions from the beginning of the process, FOR indicated that they wanted to restrict hunting on the property, and all others involved with creating the plan disagreed. When the first draft came to the Planning Commission, City staff told us this discussion had taken place early on in the process but that the restrictions had been removed from the document before ever coming to us because there was no substantiating cause to restrict hunting.

FOR's leadership remained committed to restricting hunting on the property. As a certainly well-known vocal advocate, they lobbied the City Council to come up with some kind of a compromise. It's interesting to note: FOR is the only user on the property that has proposed to curtail another user's activities. Hunters are already restricted to only hunting a very few months out of the year – and these are not the same months when campers are camping, so there is no overlap – campers just don't camp on the river during the cold winter months – it is desolate, there is no one to be seen. There is no conflict. So now we are being asked – for no substantial reason – to take away even that small time from the hunters. We are being asked to favor one recreational user of the land over another with no justifiable cause.

We were told that FOR recently talked City Council – at least preliminarily - into a "reasonable compromise" (their words) by agreeing to add language for a "safety zone" that will restrict hunting at the Confluence, which is physically located in Culpeper. The Confluence land does have nearby private properties that are hunted by private hunting groups, such as one comprised of area police officers. But the actual Confluence land is not easily assessable ...because after driving to the end of the public Richard's Ferry Road, you encounter another long wooded road, and then the land is actually gated.

So, we are talking about a finite amount of hunting on a small, really quite safe part of the property. There is simply no justifiable reason to restrict hunting on this property. Therefore I draw your attention to the latest version of the Draft Plan; page 43; Section 5.3.3.; Second paragraph, last sentence:

"A proposed compromise is to establish a 100-yard safety zone around the camping area of the Confluence."

Please note the previous two sentences:

"The plan development committee examined the issue at length and found no record of hunter/camper conflicts. Further canoeing/camping occurs primarily during the spring and summer, while hunting occurs in the fall (when river water levels are down)."

Why would you follow those two sentences with "A proposed compromise is to establish a 100-yard safety zone around the camping area of the Confluence"? It just doesn't make logical sense.

I therefore propose that we remove the compromise sentence from the document."

End of verbatim transcript.

Mr. McAfee asked for a show of hands that would be in favor of removing the language for the safety zone around the confluence. Commissioners: Spears, Whelan, Mitchell and McAfee would vote favorably to remove the safety zone language.

Mr. Ramoneda said that although he didn't voice his approval of removing the safety zone, that it would not necessarily stop him voting for approval of the Plan.

Dr. Gratz asked if the Commission votes on changes to the Plan, if the Plan would be changed before going to the City Council.

Mr. McAfee said that a Commissioner would make a motion to move the document forward with a condition/caveat to remove the safety zone language and make other changes as needed within that motion.

Dr. Gratz said he disagrees with the idea of not having safety zones. He said that hunter and camper conflict can be disastrous and one should not wait until something bad occurs. He noted that the plan (Page 43) states that: "Further, canoeing/camping occurs *primarily* during the spring and summer, while hunting occurs in the fall (when river water levels are down)." He said the catch word here is "primarily." He reiterated that not only does he believe there should be a safety zone around the confluence but that he would recommend more camping areas have safety zones.

Ms. Spears said she is concerned about the long-term potential of allowing a change to the original agreement and that it could get to the point that the use (hunting) would no longer be permitted.

Mr. Ramoneda asked if the current wording regarding the confluence safety zone is an acceptable compromise.

Mr. Nelson said it is not acceptable to the F.O.R.

Dr. Gratz asked what happened to the request from Trappers asking that the City allow trapping.

Mr. Nelson said City Council would have to rescind a ruling they made in 1990 not to allow it.

Dr. Gratz said he would have no objection to trapping.

Mr. McAfee asked that the following changes be made to the Watershed Plan:

- p. 25: Change "houses" to "residential"
- Section 5.3.3 (p. 43) Delete last sentence.
- Section 5.4.4 (p. 44) Insert "parks and" in the last sentence of the first paragraph.
- Section 5.4.5 (p. 45) Insert a reference to the Planning Office/Planning Commission
- p. 47 In the second paragraph of the Admin section, indicate that the Planning Commission will be used for the public hearing, recommendation to City Council, etc., for any plan amendments.
- p. 49 Insert "ad hoc" in the first action item under Objective 2
- p. 50 delete first action item under Objective 8

Mr. Whelan asked if the trapping language could be changed to reflect that if the City rescinds its prohibition on trapping that it would be allowed and the Plan would not have to be formally changed.

Mr. Nelson noted that if the prohibition on trapping is reversed then trapping would fall under the guidelines of the Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, so there is no need to change the language since if that were to happen the City would be completely out of it.

Mr. McAfee said that the development of this Plan has been a long road and that everyone has worked very hard to reach a balance of protection and use of the subject lands. He said that he believes those involved in the Plan's development also have the City and its citizens very close to their hearts.

Ms. Spears made a motion to recommend approval and move the Watershed Management Property Plan forward to City Council with the following changes:

- **Remove** the last sentence on page 43. *"A proposed compromise is to establish a 100-yard safety zone around the camping area at the Confluence."*
- **Remove** "Action: Post authorized safety zones(s) (p. 43)." On page 50, under Objective 8.
- **Adding** the following changes made by Chairman McAfee:
 - ❖ p. 25: Change "houses" to "residential"
 - ❖ Section 5.3.3 (p. 43) Delete last sentence.
 - ❖ Section 5.4.4 (p. 44) Insert "parks and" in the last sentence of the first paragraph.
 - ❖ Section 5.4.5 (p. 45) Insert a reference to the Planning Office/Planning Commission
 - ❖ p. 47 In the second paragraph of the Admin section, indicate that
 - the Planning Commission will be used for the public hearing,
 - recommendation to City Council, etc., for any plan amendments.
 - ❖ p. 49 Insert "ad hoc" in the first action item under Objective 2
 - ❖ p. 50 delete first action item under Objective 8

Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion.

Dr. Gratz said he did not want to be perceived as voting against the document due to allowing hunting in camping areas. However, he said the idea is to protect our resources. He said he has witnessed resources that were easily damaged due to lack of control and restrictions. He also has some reservations regarding the parking issue. He asked that the record reflect that he hopes the City Council will reinstate the safety zone at the confluence and possibly add more safety zones. He said he believes hunting and camping are incompatible and that once an accident happens it will be too late.

Mr. Mitchell commended F.O.R. for their leadership with development the Watershed Plan and said he hopes the Plan will move forward.

Motion carried by a unanimous vote of 6 – 0.

10. Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review – This is a request to confirm that the proposed new I-95 interchange near the rest area is substantially in accord with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Ocel directed Commissioners to vote on the Resolution, confirming that the proposed new I-95 Interchange near the rest area is substantially in accord with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Ramoneda made a motion to confirm Comprehensive Plan Compliance.

Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion.

Motion carried by a vote of 6 – 0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Planning Commissioner Comment

- Mr. McAfee thanked everyone for the opportunity to serve as Chair for a second term and thanked Dr. Gratz and Commissioner Mitchell for agreeing to serve as Vice-Chair and Secretary, respectively. He also thanked Ms. Spears for her term as Secretary.
- Mr. McAfee requested the Commission receive a final and adopted hard copy of the Watershed Management Plan.
- Mr. McAfee said he had previously asked Commissioners to comment on the Implementation Report composed by Mr. Ocel. Mr. Ocel said he is in the process of making changes to the document and will forward on to City Council as a report.
- Mr. McAfee thanked Mr. Ramoneda for his service as a Planning Commissioner for the past eight years and commended him for his exemplary and distinguished service and his dedication to the city and its citizens.

Planning Director Comment

- Mr. Ocel informed Commissioners that Mr. Shawn Lawrence was appointed as the replacement for Commissioner Ramoneda, and will take his seat at the first meeting in November.
- Mr. Ocel said he has received the draft of the Lafayette Boulevard Design Guidelines and will look over the document and will plan a work session for the 27th of October following the scheduled 4:00 regular meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.



Roy McAfee, Chair